

It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments introduce no new matter within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §132.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 6, 7, and 9 due to informalities. Claims 1-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, and 4-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,575,832 to Johnson (hereinafter *Johnson*); and claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious over *Johnson*. These objections and rejections, as applied to the revised claims, are respectfully traversed.

Prior Art Rejections

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections as none of the prior art references taken alone or in combination discloses all of the features of the presently claimed subject matter. Furthermore, Applicants have scheduled an interview with the Examiner to address the differences between the prior art and the claimed subject matter. If necessary, Applicant will submit a supplement to this submission under 37 C.F.R. 1.114 to adopt any suggestions made by the Examiner during the Examiner interview. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and that the case be passed to issuance.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

THE NATH LAW GROUP

February 2, 2011

THE NATH LAW GROUP
112 South West Street
Alexandria, VA 22314-2891
Tel: 703-548-6284
Fax: 703-683-8396

/Derek Richmond /
Derek Richmond
Registration No. 45,771
Stanley N. Protigal
Registration No. 28,657
Customer No. 20529